

TOBACCO INDUSTRY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
150 EAST FORTY SECOND STREET NEW YORK 17, N. Y. #42A

Application For Research Grant

(cf. Heath #42
Farnsworth #42R1
McArthur #42R2)

Date: November 28, 1956

1. Name of Investigator: Charles McArthur, Ph. D., and a principal investigator who would be a psychiatrist to be named. (Dr. Hastings was originally proposed for this assignment but was not able to come here for it. We have one nominee in mind but have not approached him as yet. He is interested in coming here and would be a good man for the job.)
2. Title:
3. Institution & Address: The University Health Services
Harvard University
78 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts
4. Project or Subject: Interviewing and perhaps retesting the participants in the Study whose earlier interviews and tests gave rise to the relationships reported in our existing work on smoking and personality.

5. Detailed Plan of Procedure (Use reverse side if additional space is needed):

Proposal Two involves an expenditure of \$75,000 between January 1, 1957 and June 30, 1960. Put simply, this would cover an all-out effort to get good and full psychiatric interviews on the Study participants. The idea that was originally phrased in terms of Dr. Hastings' visiting the participants is now re-suggested in terms of a program without a specific man's name attached. Obviously, as good a man as possible will be employed.

Three major purposes, from the smoking and personality point of view, would be (1) the obtaining of good, recorded, verbatim material that is generated when the man discusses his smoking, (2) the obtaining of facts not now in the record that are directly relevant to the hypotheses we have formulated about smoking, (3) demonstrating the reliability of (a) the instruments that have already shown relationships to smoking and (b) the relationships themselves, when the instrument is not suspect but the trend existed fifteen years ago.

The open-ended verbatim material would be most useful in enabling us to establish the truth or falseness of our psychodynamic theories about these boys' attitudes to smoking. There is no objective instrument that will tell us whether smoking is unconsciously felt to be a sin, yet that is one of the conditions for heightened ability to quit or cut down, if one of our theories is correct. There is no objective instrument that will tell us whether smoking is seen as a morally neutral act that has value only as "okay behavior" in the peer group, yet that has been postulated to be the explanation for people who smoke early and "plateau" at a relatively moderate smoking rate. Our theory, on indirect evidence, is that individual differences in tolerance for smoking have these sorts of psychodynamic explanation.

1003541575

A good interview would provide the associational material from which these unconscious meanings of smoking that we postulate could be inferred or their absence established.

The obtaining of certain facts about smoking that are critical to our present formulations would be a good entree into the topic for the interviewer. We need, for instance, memories of first cigarettes. It is our theory that the circumstances of first smoking are very determinative of later behavior. We need to know what the parents said and did about smoking; in many instances the parental attitude must have been, "Do as I say, don't do as I do" or else the inferences we take from our indirect data are all wrong. In short, some pretty obvious opening questions about smoking are available for the interviewer that should, indeed, serve to set the associational chain going, but that should also in their own right contribute validation or infirmation to our existing theories.

The matter of reliability is one that always comes up when we present our preliminary findings for scientific discussion. Other scientists immediately say either, "That instrument is not reliable" or "How do you know that that relationship is reliable?" The first objection arises, in particular, over the Rorschach we have in the Study data. Since this is an abbreviated test that could be repeated in ten minutes, one thinks that the interviewer might collect a good number of retests, so that the reliability of the instrument (over 15 years) could be established. The second argument could be met with regard to several of our personality variables. If the interview was well done (as it must be, to make this program worthwhile), we would have a new end up to date and reasonably valid estimate of several personality factors that have been shown to be related to smoking. This is especially important for any variable that we now claim predicts smoking behavior. If we say to our fellow scientists, "The fact that a man was of Type B when he was 20 predicts that he will smoke heavily by the time he is 35," they at once and universally reply, "But what does that show? Maybe he became a Type C at age 34 and that's why he's smoking heavily now!" There is now way to answer that argument except to go and look at the men now.

Obviously, this larger program would benefit the Study. It would give us invaluable follow-up material; the entire hour will not be devoted to smoking, if only because we have not told our participants of our interest in this topic. It will provide a doctor who is primarily interested in the Study and who will serve as a living focus for it, not to mention his being available to talk to the participants when they drop in on us, as they frequently do. For we are uninterested in the way that one good associational hour could provide the dynamic evidence to fuse a record into integrated explainability. We would like to set up predictions before each interview, forming psychodynamic hypotheses about the individual that would either be confirmed or revised by the interview experience, so that our understanding of each person would be solidified or advanced. Our knowledge of the dynamics would improve our knowledge of the dynamics of his smoking. And some of these advance hypotheses would certainly relate to his smoking behavior.

The tangible product of this work might be several books. One should relate to the psychodynamics of smoking, in some clinical richness, with quotations and case histories spelling out in some detail what is now inferred quite indirectly from fragments of a datum here and a datum there. For would our present theories be likely to remain unchanged and unimproved after exposure to so much good cross-validation.

10033541576

6. Budget Plan:

Salaries (including Retiring Allowances)	\$59,200
Expendable Supplies	1,200
Permanent Equipment	1,000
Overhead	5,600
Other TRAVEL EXPENSE	8,000
Total	\$75,000

7. Anticipated Duration of Work: **Until June 30, 1960**

8. Facilities and Staff Available: **See Item 1. Presumably one or more of the research assistants who have been active in the project from the outset could be retained.**

9. Additional Requirements:

NINE

10. Additional Information (Including relation of work to other projects and other sources of supply):

No other support is available for this purpose.

1003541577

Signature /S./DANA L. FARNSWORTH
Director of Project

13./JAMES R. REYNOLDS
Business Officer of the Institution